SECURITY SELF-SUFFICIENCY

Autosustainable Deurbanism and National Resilience in the Age of Drones, Biological Threats, and Hybrid Warfare

Geopolitical Supplement to Autosustainables for Global Sustainability

Xema Gatnau

Conceptual Paper on National Security and Civil Resilience

Abstract

This paper develops a geopolitical and national-security extension of the Autosustainables model. Its central thesis is that energy, food, water, digital, and community self-sufficiency has not only ecological and demographic value: it can also constitute a form of distributed civil defense. In an environment characterized by low-cost drones, precision attacks, infrastructure sabotage, cyberattacks, biological threats, logistical disruptions, and hybrid warfare, the hyperconcentration of population and services creates high-value targets and single points of failure. A population partially distributed across living plots, local nodes, and autosustainable regional networks can reduce target density, limit cascading effects, and maintain essential functions when central systems are damaged. The argument is not that dispersion is intrinsically safe or that rural life should be militarized. Dispersion increases resilience only when combined with redundancy, secure communications, local healthcare, reserves, civil training, emergency mobility, social cooperation, and clear integration with legitimate institutions. Where a state’s legal order provides for it, this architecture may also

incorporate regulated territorial defensive capabilities: selected and trained citizens placed under a public chain of command, capable of provisionally protecting the population, communications, and local infrastructure against invasions, incursions, or severe breakdowns. The paper proposes the concept of security self-sufficiency: the capacity of a family-territorial cell to protect life, preserve communications, maintain a minimum of energy, water, food, and care, and cooperate with the national network during a major crisis. In this sense, #SmartDeurbanism can also be understood as a strategy of deterrence by denial: not preventing every aggression, but ensuring that no localized disruption is sufficient to paralyze society.

Keywords: security self-sufficiency; national resilience; civil defense; networked deurbanism; #SmartDeurbanism; drones; biological threats; hybrid warfare; critical infrastructure; social continuity; deterrence by denial; comprehensive security; distributed territory; distributed territorial defense; territorial reserve; lawful defensive capability; institutional continuity.

Scope note

This text addresses only preparedness, civil protection, service continuity, and defensive resilience. It does not provide offensive instructions concerning drones, biological agents, sabotage, or weapons, nor procedures for acquiring, storing, or using armaments. Threats are examined only to the extent necessary to design a society that is less vulnerable and better able to preserve civilian life. Any defensive capability mentioned is conceived solely within applicable law, under legitimate public authority, and without endorsing private or partisan militias.

1. From Ecological Self-Sufficiency to Security Self-Sufficiency

The Autosustainables project begins from a territorial intuition: a family with housing, energy, storage, water, digital connectivity, partial productive capacity, and a community network is less dependent on centralized systems. The main paper develops the ecological, demographic, and civilizational consequences of this intuition. This supplement adds a fourth dimension: national security.

Modern security can no longer be reduced to armed forces, borders, and arsenals. NATO places resilience and civil preparedness at the core of a state’s capacity to withstand attack, maintain government, secure essential services, and support collective operations. Its baseline requirements include continuity of government, energy, population movements, food and water, communications, transport, and health-system capacity.[1][2]

The European Union has likewise adopted a logic of comprehensive preparedness. Its 2025 Preparedness Union Strategy proposes a whole-of-society approach and, among other measures, the development of guidelines enabling the population to

achieve a minimum of 72 hours of self-sufficiency during extreme disruptions.[3] Sweden recommends that households be able to manage on their own for approximately one week, while Finland organizes comprehensive security through cooperation among authorities, businesses, organizations, and citizens.[4][5]

Autosustainables can be situated within this evolution, but it takes the idea further. It is not limited to storing supplies for the first days of an emergency. It proposes reorganizing territory so that a larger share of the population lives in units that routinely produce, store, repair, communicate, and cooperate. Preparedness therefore ceases to be an emergency box added to a wholly dependent way of life and becomes integrated into the everyday architecture of dwelling.

> *Security self-sufficiency is the capacity of a family and territorial unit to preserve life, communication, basic energy, water, food, care, and cooperation during a temporary interruption of central systems.*

2. Hyperconcentration as a Strategic Vulnerability

The city concentrates productivity, knowledge, services, and culture. That concentration produces economies of scale, but it also accumulates risk. The more people and essential functions depend on a small number of power plants, stations, depots, hospitals, data centers, railway junctions, substations, and supply networks, the greater the potential damage from a localized disruption.

In urban warfare, the destruction of a single infrastructure asset can produce consequences far wider than the immediate physical damage. The International Committee of the Red Cross emphasizes that cities depend on fragile, centralized, and interconnected networks of water, electricity, sanitation, health, and transport. Damage to an upstream component of the system can deprive hundreds of thousands or millions of people of an essential service and generate domino effects across other systems.[6][7]

Hyperconcentration creates three types of vulnerability. The first is target density: a single impact can affect many people and functions. The second is cascading dependency: an electricity failure can halt communications, water pumping, refrigeration, payments, and transport. The third is impossible evacuation: a major metropolis cannot move quickly without saturating roads, stations, and logistical networks.

The conclusion is not that cities should disappear. Major hospitals, universities, ports, industrial centers, and administrations will remain necessary. The conclusion is that a country should not concentrate almost its entire population, economic capacity, and civil life in a few nodes whose failure could paralyze the whole. Resilience requires a plural geography: hardened cities, medium-sized cities, living towns, alternative logistical corridors, and a technologically enabled rural network.

3. Drones and the Democratization of Precision

The expansion of unmanned systems changes the strategic value of concentration. Drones make it possible to observe, locate, and attack targets at lower cost than traditional air systems. The Ukrainian experience has led NATO to study their impact systematically and to adapt training, analysis, and doctrine.[8]

The civil relevance of this transformation does not lie only in the fact that drones can carry explosives. They can also survey infrastructure, track movement, identify emissions, interfere with communications, or support sabotage campaigns. When a society depends on a small number of distribution centers, depots, and corridors, an adversary does not need to destroy the entire system: identifying its bottlenecks may be enough.

Contemporary military doctrine offers a useful analogy. The United States Air Force concept of Agile Combat Employment uses dispersion, mobility, and alternative locations to increase survivability, flexibility, and resilience, and to complicate the adversary’s targeting process.[9] Mechanically transferring a military doctrine to civilian populations would be inappropriate, but the general logic remains relevant: what is distributed, redundant, and able to continue operating from multiple nodes is harder to neutralize all at once.

Population dispersion does not make families invisible or turn every plot into a safe refuge. It does, however, reduce the concentration of consequences. An attack on a local node may be serious without automatically becoming a crisis for millions of people. Security derives less from concealment than from redundancy and continuity.

4. Urban Warfare, Critical Infrastructure, and Cascading Effects

Contemporary conflicts show that civilian infrastructure is not a neutral backdrop to war. Although international humanitarian law protects civilians and civilian objects, hostilities in densely populated areas generate very high direct and indirect harm. The ICRC warns that explosive weapons with wide-area effects used in populated areas damage homes and essential infrastructure and can trigger prolonged crises in water, electricity, health, and sanitation.[6][7]

National security must therefore assume that social continuity cannot depend on every central network remaining intact. European directives on critical-entity resilience and cybersecurity require the continuity of essential services to be strengthened against natural hazards, accidents, sabotage, and digital attacks.[10]

#SmartDeurbanism adds a territorial layer to these policies. A home with solar generation, batteries, water reserves, alternative communications, and some food capacity does not replace a national network, but it reduces the immediate burden on it. Thousands of similar units can absorb part of the initial impact, free public

resources for the most vulnerable, and prevent a central failure from immediately becoming a generalized household collapse.

This logic requires a distinction between independence and islanding capability. A microgrid can operate connected to the national system under normal conditions and temporarily separate during an outage. Similarly, an autosustainable community can participate fully in the national economy while retaining the capacity to maintain basic functions during a rupture.

Conceptual Matrix of Threats and Distributed Response

Threat	Vulnerability of concentration	Potential advantage of distribution	Necessary condition
Drones and precision attacks	Many targets and people depend on a few visible nodes.	Reduces the density of consequences and multiplies alternative routes and nodes.	Redundancy, warning, shelter, and secure communications.
Sabotage and cyberattacks	Simultaneous failure of centralized and interdependent services.	Microgrids, local backups, and partial offline continuity.	Cybersecurity, manual procedures, and state coordination.
Biological threat or pandemic	High connectivity and pressure on major hospitals and transport systems.	Territorial compartmentalization and distributed primary care.	Epidemiological surveillance, isolation, health logistics, and public trust.
Invasion or blockade	Dependence on major corridors, warehouses, and cities.	Territorial depth, local production, and multiple continuity centers.	National defense, mobility, network discipline, and civil protection.
Energy disruption	A single failure affects millions of passive consumers.	Local generation, storage, and islanding capability.	Maintenance, spare parts, standards, and mutual support.

5. Biological Threats: Dispersion, Compartmentalization, and Local Healthcare

Natural epidemics, laboratory accidents, and the deliberate use of biological materials belong to different legal and causal categories, but they share a defensive requirement: early detection, reliable communication, health capacity, and service continuity. The World Health Organization treats deliberate biological events as part of the public-health and security interface and emphasizes the need for health systems able to prevent, detect, respond, and recover without abandoning essential care.[11][12]

Territorial dispersion can provide a limited but real advantage: it reduces the size of some contact environments and makes it possible to compartmentalize activities, schools, care, and supplies. It is not, however, an automatic barrier. A dispersed but highly mobile network can spread infection rapidly; an isolated

community without diagnostics or institutional trust may detect an outbreak too late; and fragmented healthcare can create inequality.

Biological security self-sufficiency must therefore rest on a combination of local primary care, telemedicine, notification protocols, authorized basic reserves, temporary isolation capacity, ventilation, safe water, energy continuity for medical equipment, and rapid transport to specialist centers. The plot does not replace the hospital; it reduces unnecessary exposure and helps reserve hospital capacity for cases that genuinely require it.

The territorial network must also be informational. In a biological emergency, disinformation can be as disorganizing as the disease. Resilience requires credible authorities, transparent data, redundant channels, and prior education. An autosustainable community must not become an epistemically closed community. Its material autonomy must be accompanied by scientific and institutional integration.

6. Invasion, Hybrid Coercion, and Territorial Depth

Conventional invasion is no longer the only form of geopolitical pressure. The European Union identifies cyberattacks, sabotage, electronic interference, information manipulation, espionage, and the instrumentalization of migration flows, among other practices, as hybrid threats intended to weaken a society without always resorting to declared war.[13]

In this context, the distribution of population and capabilities has value because it creates territorial depth. A country made up of a few metropolises and vast interior voids may retain its total population while losing an everyday presence across extensive areas, infrastructure, forests, coasts, borders, and corridors. A living rural network contributes observation, maintenance, local knowledge, and the capacity to detect anomalies, support emergencies, and sustain the territory.

Civilian presence must never be confused with deliberately exposing civilians to combat. The state retains the duty to defend, evacuate, and protect the population. The argument is different: a society with a territorial presence knows its space better, maintains more routes, possesses more local resources, and preserves a human fabric on which civil protection can rely.

Distribution also complicates coercion. If supplies of energy, food, communications, and administration depend on many nodes, the threat to sever a single corridor loses some of its force. This is a civilian form of deterrence by denial: the aggressor knows that causing damage does not necessarily produce political paralysis.

7. Energy, Water, Food, and Communications: The Civil Logistics of Resistance

National defense is often imagined in terms of military platforms. Yet the actual continuity of a country depends on energy, water, food, communications, transport, health, and administration. NATO explicitly includes these domains in its resilience requirements because armed forces and government cannot function if civil society collapses.[1]

The autosustainable plot can act as a logistical micro-reserve. Photovoltaic generation and batteries maintain lighting, refrigeration, communications, pumping, and essential devices. Water capture and storage make it possible to withstand short interruptions. Gardens, storage, and local food networks cannot feed the entire population on their own, but they reduce immediate dependence on supermarkets and long-distance transport.

Communication is what turns dispersion into a network. Each node should have more than one channel: fixed and mobile networks, satellite connectivity where reasonable, and emergency radio in accordance with applicable rules. It must also be able to operate through degraded procedures: printed lists, meeting points, local coordinators, and minimum communication protocols.

Security of supply does not require every plot to accumulate resources indefinitely. It requires a layered combination: household reserves, community depots, regional warehouses, and national strategic reserves. Absolute self-sufficiency is inefficient; coordinated redundancy is resilient.

8. The Autosustainable Security Cell

From a national-security perspective, the living plot of the main paper can be reformulated as a civil continuity cell. It is neither a military unit nor a private bunker. It is a unit of life capable of maintaining basic functions and connecting with others during a crisis.

An autosustainable security cell should aspire to the following capabilities:

- minimum energy for communications, lighting, refrigeration, pumping, and priority medical needs;
- stored drinking water and basic treatment capacity in accordance with health guidance;
- food and essential products sufficient to exceed at least the European 72-hour threshold and, preferably, one week of ordinary disruption;
- two or more communication channels and a community procedure for the failure of digital networks;
- protected indoor space and knowledge of public shelters and evacuation routes;
- first-aid supplies, basic training, and connection to primary care, emergency services, and telemedicine;

- capacity for temporary isolation during health threats without breaking public notification and coordination;
- tools, critical spare parts, and elementary repair capacity;
- trust-based relationships with neighbors, cooperatives, local authorities, and civil-protection services;
- periodic training in first aid, fires, power outages, disinformation, and response to official alerts.

The unit should be measured not only by what it stores, but by how long it preserves functions and by its capacity to assist others. An autosustainable plot that protects only its owners while disconnecting from the community is less useful to national security than a moderately autonomous unit integrated into a support network.

9. Multilevel Architecture: Cell, Node, Region, and State

Distributed security requires multiple scales. The family or plot preserves immediate functions; the local node shares equipment and organizes care; the region maintains reserves and specialized services; the state provides intelligence, defense, regulation, major infrastructure, and redistribution. No scale replaces the others.

This design resembles Finland’s comprehensive security and Sweden’s total defense, which assign roles to authorities, companies, organizations, and citizens. The strength of these models does not lie in abandoning the state, but in preventing all capability from depending exclusively on the center.[4][5]

At the local level, a network of plots can share vehicles, generation, storage, pumps, tools, radio, shelter spaces, care, and reserves. At the regional level, medium-sized cities and district centers should concentrate hospitals, workshops, warehouses, administration, and transport connections. At the national level, robust backbone networks, strategic reserves, air defense, cybersecurity, and reconstruction capacity must be maintained.

The guiding principle is resilient subsidiarity: each function should be delivered at the nearest level capable of performing it safely, while higher levels must provide backup when local capacity is exceeded.

Scale of Security Self-Sufficiency

Scale	Primary function	Capabilities	Failure prevented
Family/plot	Immediate survival and continuity	72 hours to 7 days, minimum energy, water, food, communication, and first aid.	Immediate conversion of an outage into a life-threatening emergency.

Local node	Mutual aid and shared services	Microgrid, shelter, tools, transport, care, and coordination.	Isolation and inequality between households.
Region/district	Specialization and reserves	Hospital, warehouses, repair, logistics, administration, and communications.	Exclusive dependence on the capital or metropolis.
State	Defense, intelligence, and redistribution	Armed forces, civil protection, backbone networks, strategic reserves, and regulation.	Fragmentation and abandonment of affected territories.

10. Dispersion as Deterrence by Denial

Deterrence does not consist only in threatening retaliation. It can also be based on denying the adversary the expectation of achieving a decisive result. A society capable of continuing to govern, communicate, and supply itself after limited attacks reduces the political value of those attacks.

Dispersion strengthens deterrence by denial when four conditions are met: the aggressor cannot identify a single center whose fall would paralyze the system; essential functions exist in more than one location; the population knows how to act during disruption; and the state can rapidly reconnect and support damaged nodes.

In this sense, #SmartDeurbanism is not a strategy of flight, but of permanence. Society does not abandon national space in the face of a threat; it distributes its capacity to live and continue across a larger part of the territory.

Security self-sufficiency also does not replace conventional defense. Without control of the airspace, intelligence, armed forces, police, borders, and alliances, civilian units may remain exposed. The value of distribution is complementary: it gives state protection something more resilient to protect.

11. Defensive Self-Sufficiency and Distributed Territorial Capability

Security self-sufficiency should not be limited to storing food, water, energy, medicines, or spare parts. In extreme scenarios of invasion, territorial occupation, hybrid warfare, attacks on infrastructure, or prolonged interruption of central authority, a genuinely resilient community may also need the capacity to protect its members, basic resources, and communications.

A dispersed population is less vulnerable to simultaneous destruction than a concentrated population. Dispersion alone, however, does not guarantee security. To become a strategic advantage, it must be integrated into a national architecture of defense, civil protection, and institutional continuity. The

autosustainable cell does not replace the state: it extends the state’s territorial capacity to remain present, observe, assist, and rebuild.

Where national legislation permits, some cells or nodes could include citizens who have been previously selected, identified, and trained, as well as defensive means proportionate to their function. Their mission would be to provide provisional protection for the population, communications, essential resources, and local infrastructure against incursions, sabotage, organized looting, or attempted occupation until regular forces arrive or reorganize.

The proposal is not to create private militias, armed ideological organizations, or autonomous territorial powers. It is to examine a distributed territorial defensive capability that is legally regulated, subordinate to legitimate institutions, and compatible with the armed forces, police, civil protection, and emergency services.

The specific institutional form will vary according to each state’s constitutional history, strategic culture, and legal system. It may take the form of territorial reserves, civil-defense systems, auxiliary infrastructure-protection units, trained volunteers, citizen reservists linked to a district, or exceptional mechanisms of territorial mobilization. What matters is not copying one national model, but preserving three universal principles: public legitimacy, prior preparation, and effective coordination.

Three Levels of Preparedness

The autosustainable cell can be understood through three cumulative levels of preparedness:

- Passive resilience: shelter, energy, water, food, redundant communications, health resources, protection against contamination, and temporary isolation capacity.
- Operational resilience: first aid, initial fire suppression, emergency communications, evacuation, decontamination, elementary repair, territorial observation, and logistical support.
- Active defensive capability: only where authorized by law, selected and trained citizens protecting the population and local infrastructure against armed threats under legitimate command and strict activation rules.

The third level should not be measured by the quantity of weapons available, but by the institutional discipline that contains it. The fundamental distinction is not between an armed and an unarmed population, but between a legally organized defensive capability and uncontrolled private violence.

Minimum Safeguards

Any system of distributed territorial defense should, at a minimum, be subject to the following safeguards:

- an explicit constitutional and legal basis;
- selection, identification, and verification of the fitness of participating persons;
- initial and periodic training, including discipline, civilian protection, and coordinated action;
- registration, inventory, and secure custody of authorized means;
- a public chain of command and precise rules for activation, deactivation, and use;
- judicial, administrative, and democratic oversight;
- prohibition of partisan, sectarian, or autonomous armed organizations;
- withdrawal of authorization when requirements cease to be met or abuses occur.

The purpose would not be to militarize everyday life permanently, but to prevent a wholly concentrated, dependent society lacking territorial preparedness from being paralyzed through the destruction of a small number of command centers, electricity networks, depots, logistical nodes, or communication systems.

Dispersion and Deterrence by Denial

Territorial defensive capability reinforces deterrence by denial. It does not necessarily threaten the adversary with greater retaliation; it signals that occupation, coercion, or paralysis will not easily produce a decisive result. Control of a capital, a backbone network, or a major logistical center does not automatically amount to functional control of the territory if thousands of nodes can preserve energy, water, communications, care, basic production, and institutional cooperation.

The objective is not to turn every home into a fortress. It is to prevent the fall of one center from causing the fall of the whole. Central forces provide power, intelligence, mobility, and coordination; territorial cells provide presence, local knowledge, continuity, and distributed resistance.

The autosustainable plot should not become a private fortress, but it may, where the legal order provides for it, constitute a prepared cell of national defense and resilience.

Material self-sufficiency to survive. Public organization to coordinate. Legitimate defensive capability to prevent domination.

12. Risks and Limits of the Model

Territorial distribution is not an automatic solution and can create vulnerabilities of its own. Isolated homes may be harder to protect, reach, and evacuate. Dispersion may increase emergency response times, maintenance costs, and dependence on cars. A closed community may amplify rumors and resist health instructions. Digitalized microgrids may add cyberattack surfaces. Poorly planned low density may also consume land and fragment ecosystems.

The model must therefore avoid six errors. First, confusing security with isolation. Second, turning every property into a private fortress. Third, replacing public services with unsupported individual responsibility. Fourth, dispersing population without creating nodes, transport, and healthcare. Fifth, justifying scattered urbanization under the label of self-sufficiency. Sixth, confusing a regulated territorial reserve with private militias or with the armed autonomy of political, religious, or community groups.

There is also a military tension: dispersion reduces target density but increases the perimeter that must be monitored. The response is not to fill the territory with checkpoints, but to combine low density with legitimate civilian sensors, public warning, forest presence, maintained roads, local services, and state response capacity.

The most defensible thesis is therefore comparative: relative to extreme hyperconcentration, a partial, orderly, and connected distribution can increase national resilience. The proposal is not to disperse the entire population absolutely or to deny the advantages of the city.

13. Public-Policy Proposal for Europe

Security self-sufficiency could become a pillar of territorial policy, civil protection, and strategic autonomy. A coherent program would include:

- incorporating national-resilience criteria into spatial planning and rural-housing policy;
- enabling lawful living plots grouped in networks and connected to existing settlements, while preventing unauthorized development;
- establishing islanding-capability standards for buildings, energy communities, and critical services;
- financing storage, water, redundant communications, and housing rehabilitation in municipalities losing population;
- strengthening medium-sized cities and district centers as healthcare, logistical, and administrative nodes;
- mapping critical dependencies and single points of failure in energy, water, food, telecommunications, and transport;
- conducting periodic 72-hour and one-week civil exercises with simulated energy and communications outages;
- integrating agricultural cooperatives, businesses, associations, and citizens into civil-protection planning;
- ensuring alternative procedures for payments, identification, communication, and administration when digital systems fail;
- incorporating preparedness, first aid, media literacy, and emergency response into education;
- strengthening epidemiological surveillance and rural primary care so that dispersion does not entail delayed treatment;

- coordinating repopulation and forest stewardship with fire prevention, water management, and road maintenance.
- examining, in accordance with each country’s constitutional framework, territorial reserves and regulated civilian defensive capabilities integrated into the public chain of command and subject to democratic controls;

Policy should neither impose migration from cities nor idealize rural life. It should open a genuine option for those who wish to live outside the metropolis while turning that option into an asset for the nation as a whole. Security benefits when residential freedom coincides with territorial continuity.

14. Indicators for Measuring Security Self-Sufficiency

The concept must be measurable. Security self-sufficiency cannot remain a metaphor. Indicators should assess both local capacity and connection to the public network.

A composite index could include: hours of essential energy without the grid; days of drinking water; days of basic food; number of communication channels; time to access healthcare; availability of alternative routes; percentage of local energy production; offline operating capacity; participation in exercises; density of single points of failure; proportion of the population covered by regional nodes; and estimated time to restore functions.

Inequality of resilience must also be measured. A society in which wealthy households enjoy prolonged autonomy while poorer households lose water or heating after a few hours is not secure. Security self-sufficiency must be designed as a distributed public good, with specific support for older people, dependents, the ill, and those with fewer resources.

The objective is not to maximize each unit’s autonomy indefinitely, but to identify the point at which local investment efficiently reduces systemic risk. Beyond a certain level, it may be better to share resources at the community node than to duplicate them in every home.

15. Conclusion: A Distributed Population Is a Strategic Reserve of Continuity

Autosustainables proposes that the basic unit of the future should be the connected living plot. From the perspective of national security, that same unit can function as a civil continuity cell. Its value does not lie in resisting every threat alone, but in preventing society from depending entirely on unique centers and fragile chains.

In the age of drones, sabotage, cyberattacks, and biological threats, extreme concentration multiplies the potential effectiveness of every impact. Orderly distribution reduces the density of consequences. In hybrid warfare, absolute

dependence facilitates coercion. Partial self-sufficiency creates room for decision. In health crises, compartmentalization can buy time. During blockades, local production and reserves sustain continuity. In every case, the network transforms dispersed units into society.

The central geopolitical thesis is that inhabited territory constitutes security infrastructure. A nation is sustained not only by its legal borders and centers of power, but by the everyday presence of people capable of knowing, maintaining, producing, communicating, and cooperating throughout its space.

A resilient country needs cities capable of withstanding disruption, but also medium-sized cities, living towns, managed countryside, distributed energy networks, prepared families, and connected communities. It needs strong centers without depending on a single center.

> *Dispersion without a network is fragility. A network without autonomy is dependence. Security self-sufficiency combines local autonomy, territorial fraternity, and state capacity.*

The plot is the cell; the local node, the tissue; the region, the organ; and the state, the common architecture that coordinates, protects, and redistributes fractally. The more capable each scale is of preserving its functions and supporting the others, the less likely a limited aggression is to become a national collapse.

#SmartDeurbanism can therefore be more than an ecological proposal. It can become a policy of comprehensive security and deterrence by denial: a way of keeping society alive, organized, and governable even when part of its infrastructure has been damaged. Where each state’s legislation permits, this architecture may also incorporate territorial reserves and regulated civilian defensive capabilities, not to replace institutions, but to extend their presence and protective capacity across the territory.

Self-sufficiency in the cell. Resilience in the network. Legitimate defense and decentralized national security.

References

[1] NATO. “Resilience, civil preparedness and Article 3”. 2024. Official source

[2] NATO. “Strengthened Resilience Commitment”. 2021. Official source

[3] European Commission and High Representative. “EU Preparedness Union Strategy”. 2025. Official source

[4] Swedish Civil Defence and Resilience Agency. “In case of crisis or war”. 2024. Official source

[5] Security Committee of Finland. “Security Strategy for Society”. 2025 update. Official source

[6] International Committee of the Red Cross. “Urban warfare and violence”. Official source

[7] International Committee of the Red Cross. “Preventing and mitigating the indirect effects on essential services from the use of explosive weapons in populated areas”. 2024. Official source

[8] NATO. “Drones - Lessons from Ukraine”. 2025. Official source

[9] United States Air Force. “Agile Combat Employment”. Air Force Doctrine Note 1-21, 2022. Official source

[10] European Union. Directive (EU) 2022/2557 on the resilience of critical entities; Directive (EU) 2022/2555 (NIS2). Official source

[11] World Health Organization. “Strengthening the global health-security interface”. Official source

[12] World Health Organization. “Health systems resilience”. Official source

[13] European Commission. “White Paper for European Defence - Readiness 2030”. 2025. Official source

[14] Comparative concept of territorial defense and civil reserve: a normative and abstract formulation of this paper, adaptable to each state’s constitutional and legal framework.

[15] Gatnau, Xema. “Autosustainables for Global Sustainability”. Reference paper for the Autosustainables project.